

At any rate, the Jews are getting the brunt of Soviet official religious persecution. The Congress of the United States of America can do no less than take note of this unhappy fact.

Eyewitness accounts of Soviet anti-Semitism have been printed in numerous publications in this country. One of the most pungent accounts that I have seen appears in the February 4, 1965, issue of the Texas Jewish Post, as quoted in Jess Lawin's column. With unanimous consent, I am inserting the "Report on Russia" at this point in the RECORD:

Recently we brought you a report on Germany and the need to extend the statute of limitations which the West German Government plans to allow to expire this coming May 8.

This week we've garnered a factual report from Soviet Russia. It concerns an eyewitness account from a man who has made several trips to Russia on cultural and other missions. Because we do not want to interfere with his freedom of action and entrance to the Soviet Union we are withholding his name.

This is his account:

"A recent visit to the Soviet Union has served to confirm the existence of serious problems and pressures on the organized Jewish community and on Jewish life generally. Americans who visited major cities were able to talk at length with qualified observers in the press and diplomatic corps and, to some degree, with Jews themselves. They found Jews eager to contact, but often apprehensive of the consequences. On more than one occasion, Jews spoke Yiddish, but switched to another language when they saw Russians watching or listening. The main synagogue in Moscow was filled on a typical Saturday morning, but most of those present were women and men past the retirement age. Saturday is a working day in the Soviet Union until 3 p.m. Men must therefore choose between their work and their religious duty. Few can afford the latter choice.

"The Soviet Union is of course opposed officially to all religion. But observation confirmed that this opposition is applied far more severely against the Jews than some other religions. Religious life at the center of the Armenian Christian Church in Echmiadzin, for example, was obviously flourishing, and enjoyed the uninhibited support and presence of the congregants. One journalist offered this formulation: Official antireligious policies provide a convenient screen behind which Soviet officials, particularly at lower levels, can indulge their traditional anti-Semitism. Yet, one found the Jews lively in their curiosity and open in their friendliness to American visitors. They clearly feel deep bonds linking them to American Jewry and welcome visitors to their services.

"It was possible to discuss with observers, the question of the usefulness of public organized protest and pressure in the United States against Soviet acts and policies which embody anti-Semitism or excessive pressure. These observers were unanimous and emphatic in stating that these activities are important and useful, and should be continued. This is not only because they expose and embarrass the Soviet Government on this issue, which is true, or that they stimulate the U.S. Government to greater awareness and responsiveness, which is also true; there is also the effect on the morale of the Jews in the Soviet Union. Lacking organized channels of communication, such as newspapers, they rely on the shortwave radio for much of their news of Jewish interest. Those who have radios tell others and news spreads. Kol Yisroel, the Israel

radio, broadcasts in Yiddish and is heard in the Soviet Union. Accounts of American protests and expressions of sympathy with the plight of Jews in the Soviet Union plays a prominent part in these broadcasts, and—we are assured—does much to support and strengthen the morale and steadfastness of the Jews.

"Some American Jews have questioned these activities on the ground that they may be harmful to the cause of ultimately improving the lot and freedom of the Jews in the Soviet Union. These fears appear to be incorrectly based. It would seem from the conversations which recently took place in Moscow that American protests serve a positive purpose, and should be continued."

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. CONYERS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. CONYERS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. CONYERS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### LET A JUST NATION PROVIDE HOSPITAL CARE FOR THE ELDERLY

(Mr. McDOWELL (at the request of Mr. CONYERS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, an article in the AFL-CIO American Federationist, February 1965, by Nelson H. Cruikshank, director of the AFL-CIO Department of Social Security, may be of some help to the Members of this House in their consideration of the issues involved in legislation providing hospital care for the elderly under social security, and I include it here for that reason as part of my remarks:

[From the AFL-CIO American Federationist, February 1965]

#### THE FINAL PUSH TO WIN HOSPITAL CARE (By Nelson H. Cruikshank)

"Let a just nation throw open . . . the city of promise . . . to the elderly, by providing hospital care under social security and by raising benefit payments to those struggling to maintain the dignity of their later years." So spoke the President of the United States in his state of the Union message to Congress on January 4, 1965.

This pledge of the President was greeted by the loudest and most prolonged applause of any part of his message. It is the intention of the AFL-CIO in the period ahead to see that this applause is turned into votes and a long-discussed bill turned from a topic of debate and strife into law.

Millions of people throughout the country, young and old, have been hopeful for several years that the passage of this legislation was imminent. Now at last these hopes may well be realized. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Anthony Celebrezze told 1,500 cheering members of the National Council of Senior Citizens who came to Washington for the opening of Congress that "We're on the eve of victory in a good and noble humanitarian cause." Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, predicted the bill would be on the President's desk, ready for his signature by Easter.

While there are still many obstacles to overcome, the situation in Congress is vastly improved over any that hospital care legislation has ever faced before.

The massive victory of the Johnson-Humphrey ticket in the 1964 election was, and is widely acknowledged as being, a clear mandate for the speedy enactment of hospital care. The candidates for President and Vice President all expressed their positions strongly and clearly, for and against expanding social security to encompass health insurance. No proponent of health insurance on the Ways and Means Committee lost in the election. The three most adamant committee opponents were roundly defeated. While there has been much discussion about the meaning of various opinion polls on hospital care, the outcome of this poll—the only national poll not taken on a sampling basis—was clear: the people of this country want their social security system continued and they want it built on and expanded to include health benefits for the elderly.

The worst threat to old-age security today is the high cost of illness. People aged 65 and over get sick more often and for longer periods of time than the rest of the population. They need much more expensive hospital and posthospital care and they have much less money to meet the costs of illness. With hospital rates now up to \$35 or \$40 a day in many cities, these elderly people desperately need prepaid health insurance protection. And their families need the protection against the economic havoc and emotional destruction they now face when serious illness strikes at their older members. The general design of a workable remedy became clear beyond doubt in the 88th Congress—a national hospital insurance system based on social security principles for those over 65.

To make social security truly effective in reducing poverty, substantial increases in cash benefits are also necessary—for the retired, the disabled, and for widows and dependent children.

Legislation to meet these objectives has been introduced in this Congress by Senator ANDERSON and Representative CECIL R. KING, Democrat, of California. It is based, with minor modifications, on the Anderson-King bill which was considered by the last Congress and the Anderson-Gore amendment which passed the Senate last summer.

In the last session, a hospital care bill was defeated in conference committee. The bill that was before the Senate and House conferees provided for increased cash benefits as well as health benefits. A deadlock occurred when the House conferees took the position that no bill with hospital care was acceptable and the Senate conferees stuck by their position that no bill without hospital care was acceptable. In conference there are only two votes, one by the Senate managers and one by the House managers. Congressman WILBUR MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas, joined the two Republican House conferees to make a majority of three to two against the hospital care provisions.

The proponents of cash benefits in the social security measure without any hospital insurance in effect dared the proponents to hold up that bill, saying, you don't dare go into an election having turned down \$7 a

city to build housing for the people of Bellevue Hospital on highway and air rights over the East River Drive and suggested that the HRR rehabilitate rather than tear up the seven-block area. This proposal was presented at a city hall hearing and, despite loud and enthusiastic support, was quickly forgotten.

It is precisely this conflict between rehabilitation and bulldozing that cuts to the heart of urban renewal. Everybody agrees slums and blight are bad. It is the method of getting rid of them that disturbs many people and the city's haphazard planning that disturbs many more.

There will always be a basic conflict where urban renewal is concerned. The city government will always insist a project is for the greater good and the area's residents and small businessmen will invariably insist that it isn't. This conflict is not difficult to understand.

In many instances, these people have paid a price for progress that is truly necessary for the city's greater good. Yet, in the case of Bellevue South and other projects where haphazard planning, indecision, and politics have caused further and greater hardship on the area's residents and businessmen, the price for progress is too high. Here, the people have ceased to be victims of urban renewal. They have become instead victims of the city administration.

#### HOME RULE FOR WASHINGTON

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. CONYERS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced President Johnson's suggested bill for home rule for the District of Columbia. The bill provides for an elected mayor, city council, and a nonvoting delegate to this body.

I have been a supporter and a worker for home rule for Washington ever since I came to the Congress. It is right. It is just. I do not see how we can continue to deny the residents of the District of Columbia the same rights and privileges of responsible citizenship that every other American enjoys.

The plain and simple truth is that this is not just a struggle for the right to vote. This is a fundamental part of the 20th-century struggle for freedom. How can this great Nation continue to urge self-determination for the captive nations of Europe, for the former colonial nations in Africa and Asia, when we still deny the residents of our own Capital City that same self-determination?

In his message to the Congress urging the enactment of home rule legislation President Johnson said:

The restoration of home rule to the citizens of the District of Columbia must no longer be delayed.

These are my sentiments. I believe that they are the sentiments of the majority of the Members of this House. I urge the chairman of the District Committee, our distinguished colleague from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN], to refer this bill to a subcommittee as soon as possible so that hearings can be scheduled and a report on home rule legislation filed with the House without any undue delay.

#### GOLD COVER

(Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. CONYERS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have supported the passage of H.R. 3818 to eliminate the requirement that the Federal Reserve banks maintain 25 percent in gold certificates against deposits. As pointed out in the debate, this bill will help eliminate any unnecessary questions or doubts about our ability to support sustained and healthy growth at home and to back our pledge to maintain a stable dollar. The bill has the support of our bankers and economists in general.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of this bill must in no way defer immediate attention to the serious and urgent problem of gold flow abroad, so compellingly brought to our attention by the outflow the fourth quarter of last year. The White House has indicated that the President has this matter under study and will announce a revised program in the near future.

I am confident the President will take the steps necessary to meet this serious problem. The international prestige and economic power of the Nation are very much at stake, and here at home we certainly cannot have a Great Society without a sound dollar.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the time is at hand when we must recognize that some relatively severe, and at least in part, unpopular additional measures may be required to curb the flow of gold overseas.

Such measures as these may prove to be necessary:

A tax on bank loans to foreigners.

Increased tax on purchase of foreign securities.

Tax incentives to foreigners who invest dollars in the United States.

Tie AID dollars to purchase of U.S. goods.

A Federal tax on U.S. tourists going abroad.

Further reduction in duty-free allowance for returning tourists.

Further steps to encourage our international neighbors to visit the United States.

Insistence that our NATO allies foot a larger share of Western European defense costs.

Restrictions on the sales of non-U.S. goods at oversea post exchanges and commissaries.

Limitation of military aid to that involving military equipment produced in the United States.

A program of commercial aircraft and shipbuilding incentives to encourage users to purchase U.S.-made planes and ships.

Encouragement of U.S. firms making capital investments abroad to use local currency rather than U.S. dollars.

A program offering intensified governmental and private assistance in building export markets, helping the largest producers and small business as well.

The increased use of agricultural surpluses as the catalytic means of devel-

oping permanent demand for the purchase of U.S. farm products abroad.

#### BOY SCOUT WEEK IN AMERICA

(Mr. IRWIN (at the request of Mr. CONYERS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind this body that this is a national observance of Boy Scout Week in America. I believe this observance is especially significant because the theme is "Our American Heritage" and Boy Scouts all over this country are pausing to examine those strengths of our institutions which continue to contribute to the dynamic growth of our democratic way of life.

Permit me to make special mention of a group of Boy Scouts in my district in Connecticut. I refer to Troop 22 of St. Mary's Church in Greenwich. Their particular project is to study the Congress of the United States, to find out how it works and what it is contributing to the preservation and extension of our American heritage. To assist this particular troop in this effort, I am giving copies of this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to members of the troop for their further study.

#### ANTI-SEMITISM IN THE SOVIET UNION

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. CONYERS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am one of the 122 Members of the House of Representatives who have introduced resolutions condemning anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union. Undoubtedly many more Congressmen will join with us to voice their opposition to this vicious practice.

Prejudice, bigotry, and discrimination on the grounds of race, religion, or national origin, or on any other unreasonable grounds, are to be deplored wherever they occur, at home as well as abroad. Such irrational behavior may, in fact, never be completely eradicated from any society on this earth. But racial and religious persecution are particularly malevolent when they are supported officially or unofficially by the state.

Religious persecution is the policy of the Government of the Soviet Union. And not only Jews are being persecuted. Members of all religious faiths are suffering under the pressures being exerted by the Soviet police state, for the Soviet Union is opposed officially to all religion. That is why the resolution introduced by we 122 Members of Congress declares:

It is the sense of the Congress that persecution of any persons because of their religion by the Soviet Union be condemned.

Yet, there is also evidence that the Soviet Union is using its official antireligious policies as a screen behind which Government officials can hide while practicing their traditional anti-Semi-